

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-29 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 4, 10, 13, 16, 22, and 24 have been amended.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 statutory “same invention” type double patenting. The claims are rejected as purportedly being unpatentable over claims 1-6, 8-18, 20-24 and 27-29 of U.S. Application No.10/688,425. Since this is a provisional rejection, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be held in abeyance until allowable subject matter is indicated in the copending application.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,099,350 issued to Peterson (“Peterson”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 1, 10, 13, and 22

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference fails to disclose each element of claim 1. In order to further distinguish the claimed invention, claim 1 has been amended to recite, in relevant part, a relationship data element comprising a plurality of elements, where a first element corresponds to a first entity of the plurality of entities, and a second element corresponds to a second entity. As an initial matter, support for these amendments is found, at least, at ¶ [0014] (e.g., “a data object format is provided that allows for relationships...to be modeled as attributes of an entity,” and “the relationships may include basic elements of invoice adjustment data object formats from various business applications,”) and ¶ [0028] (e.g., “the common data object format may include basic elements of invoice adjustment data object formats from various business applications”) of Applicants’ Specification. No new matter is added.

Applicants also note that the Office Action fails to meaningfully address the claim terms directed to a relationship data element that specifies a relationship between a plurality of entities. The Office Action refers to portions of Peterson that purportedly disclose parties having a business relationship. Office Action, p. 4. However, the Office Action fails to assert that Peterson discloses a relationship data element of a common data object format, as recited by claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that these claim terms impart significant meaning to the claim and cannot be ignored. Applicants further submit that the cited portions of Peterson fail to disclose these features.

As will be appreciated by those of skill in the art, and as clearly indicated by Applicants' Specification, methods of sharing information between companies and applications often suffer from an inability to share information, resulting in part from an inability to effectively model relationships between various parties. To this end, claim 1 recites a relationship data element that specifies at least one relationship between a plurality of entities. Applicants submit that the Office Action has failed to provide any indication that Peterson includes such teachings. Applicants respectfully submit that this is because Peterson fails to do so.

The presently submitted amendments recite additional features of the claimed common data object format's relationship data element. Specifically, the amendments indicate that the relationship data element comprises elements corresponding to multiple (a first and second) application-specific data object formats. Applicants respectfully submit that such features are not disclosed by the cited portions of Peterson. It is unsurprising that the cited portions of Peterson fail to disclose a common data object format that includes a relationship data element comprising elements corresponding to multiple application-specific data object formats at least because Peterson fails to recognize any such need, or advantage that may result from including elements from a first and second application-specific data object format in a single common data object format.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to claim 1, as well as claims 1, 10, 13,

and 22, which contain substantially similar features, and all claims that depend therefrom, and an indication of the allowability of same.

Claims 4, 16, and 24

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references further fail to disclose the elements of claim 4, which has been amended to recite, in relevant part, receiving additional invoice adjustment information in a second application-specific data object format, translating the additional invoice adjustment information into the common invoice adjustment data object format, and storing invoice adjustment information along with the additional invoice adjustment information, in a single common data object which is in the common data object format. As an initial matter, support for these amendments is found, at least, at ¶ [0015] (e.g., “invoice adjustment information from each of several business applications,”) and ¶ [0028] (e.g., “the common data object format may include basic elements of invoice adjustment data object formats from various business applications,”) of Applicants’ Specification. No new matter is added.

Applicants respectfully submit that Peterson fails to disclose combining invoice adjustment information from multiple application-specific data object formats into a single common data object format. Applicants further submit that it is unsurprising that Peterson fails to disclose such teachings because, as noted above, Peterson fails to consider any advantage that may result from combining elements from a first and second application-specific data object format into a single common data object format.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner’s reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to claim 4, as well as claims 16 and 24, which contains substantially similar limitations, and an indication of the allowability of same.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5092.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicants hereby petition for such extensions. Applicants also hereby authorize that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to Deposit Account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,

/Shawn Doman/

Shawn Doman
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 60,362
Telephone: (512) 439-5092
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099